

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM San Diego Main Library 2057

Overall Rating

4

Ratings Summary

<i>BOND ACT CRITERIA</i>	<i>RATING</i>	
Urban and Rural		See Map
Population Growth		87%
Age and Condition	3	
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	4	
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	4	
Appropriateness of site	4	
Financial capacity (new libraries only)		yes

Non-Evaluative Comments

None.

Project Summary

<i>Applicant:</i>	San Diego, City of
<i>Library Jurisdiction:</i>	San Diego Public Library
<i>Project Type/Priority:</i>	New Library/1
<i>Project Square Footage:</i>	286,327
<i>State Grant Request:</i>	\$20,000,000

EVALUATION FORM

San Diego Main Library 2057

Age and Condition of Existing Library

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendices 1 & 3

Age Rating

- 4 = No Existing Facility
- 4 = 1949 or older
- 3 = 1950-1959
- 2 = 1960-1964
- 1 = 1965-1974
- 0 = 1975-2003

RATING

3

3

4

Structural Renovation Rating

- 4 = No Renovation
- 4 = 1954 & earlier
- 3 = 1955-1962
- 2 = 1963-1972
- 1 = 1973-1978
- 0 = 1979-2003

- 4 = Extremely Poor Condition
- 3 = Poor condition
- 2 = Acceptable condition
- 1 = Good condition
- 0 = Very good condition

Condition of Existing Library

1. Structural
2. Lighting
3. Energy
4. Health & Safety
5. ADA
6. Acoustical
7. Flexibility
8. Spatial Relationships
9. Site Considerations

R1	R2	R3
4	3	4
3	2	2
3	3	3
4	3	3
3	3	2
3	3	2
4	3	4
3	3	3
3	3	3

Rating panel comments

Library construction date: 1954

Library renovation date: None

R1:

Primary problems present in the current facility are the presence of asbestos throughout the building, mechanical systems at the end of their useful lives, inadequate telecommunication infrastructure, lack of ADA accessibility, lack of insulation, single-paned glass, and inability to remedy space issues due to interior inflexibility as well as vertical expansion being cost prohibitive.

EVALUATION FORM

San Diego Main Library 2057

R2:

This asbestos-laden structure's electrical system is at maximum capacity; cast iron plumbing is in a state of decay and the building is inefficient in most of its core areas, with limited capability for reconfiguring space for virtually any purpose such as additional shelving, expansion of collections or to meet public demand for more open stacks. Downtown traffic greatly impedes access to the facility.

R3:

This building was built to serve .5 million people and now serves a population of 2.5 million. The overtaxed electrical and cabling systems along with worn plumbing as well as a 1957 HVAC system make the building difficult to maintain. Along with inadequate restroom capacity, a building of this age has asbestos and lead paint, which hinder remodeling of space for more efficient use. Efforts have been made to make the best use of the available space; the flexibility is not there.

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

San Diego Main Library 2057

Needs and Response to Needs

Regulatory Basis: 20440 pp. 26, 27, 60-69

RATING

4

Community Library Needs Assessment

1. Methodology & community involvement.
2. Community analysis/community agencies & organizations, service area demographics
3. Analysis of service needs/consistency with demographics
4. Service limitations for existing facility (if applicable)
5. Space needs assessment
6. Executive summary includes description of K-12 student population and their needs

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	3	4
4	4	4
4	3	4
3	3	3

Library Plan of Service

7. How well project responds to needs of residents
8. How well project responds to needs of K-12 students as expressed in Needs Assessment
9. How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators are documented
10. How well types of services are documented
11. How well types of K-12 services are documented
12. How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	3	3
4	3	4
4	4	4

Library Building Program

13. How well Building Program implements Plan of Service.
14. How well Building Program documents general requirements for Library Building.
15. How well spatial relationships are described.
16. How well individual spaces are sized and described.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	2	3

Conceptual Plans

17. How well net-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
18. How well non-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
19. How well spatial relationships on plan match Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	3	3
3	2	3
3	3	3

Joint Use Cooperative Agreement

20. How well roles & responsibilities are defined.
21. How clearly joint library services are described.
22. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of hours of service.
23. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of staffing/volunteers.
24. How well ownership issues are resolved
25. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of sources & uses of funding
26. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of review & modification process
27. How well agreement demonstrates a workable, mutually beneficial long-term partnership.

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
4	4	4
2	3	3
3	3	3
3	4	4
4	4	4
3	3	3
3	3	4

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

San Diego Main Library 2057

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

Needs Assessment:

The community analysis incorporated a broad range of methods to gain input from as many user groups as possible. The analysis demonstrates that the results of the needs assessment were carefully considered and that logical, insightful conclusions were drawn concerning library service needs. The space needs assessment is very thorough and well documented.

Plan of Service:

Planned services are clearly written and correspond to the findings of the needs assessment. The goals and objectives are well-written and are written from the user's perspective, and the service indicators should be useful in assessing the success of the services. From reading the plan, the reader has a clear picture of the role of central library.

Joint Use Agreement:

The agreement represents a mutually beneficial, long-term agreement, with the school district providing financial and human resources for the joint services. While the description of the services is detailed, the agreement would be improved if staffing responsibilities for each of the services were expanded. Review of the services will occur on a regular schedule, which should ensure the services remain responsive to students' needs.

Building Program:

The general requirements section is very well detailed and is comprehensive. Spatial relationships are very well described in narrative form as well as with very helpful spatial diagrams for each floor. If there is a shortcoming it is that the spatial relationships for smaller spaces within larger areas are not very well defined such as in the Administration section. While the overall organization leaves something to be desired (probably the result of the program having been written over different time periods and by different people), the space descriptions are very effectively communicated and appear to be appropriately sized.

Conceptual Plans:

For the most part, it is impossible to tell if the net-assignable space for smaller spaces within larger areas has been met since the net square footage is usually not shown on the plan. However, overall, it appears that the net-assignable square footage on the plan matches what was called for in the building program quite well with the following exception: The amount of compact shelving called for in the building program on the 4th floor is 5,194 sq. ft., but there is only 3,588 sq. ft. shown on the plan; the amount of space shown on the plan for the backfile magazines is quite a bit less than called for in the building program (1,000 sq. ft. vs 2,149 sq. ft.); the reviewer has been unable to find a statement of non-assignable square footage in the building program or on the plans. However, it appears that if all of the net-assignable space in the program is added up and subtracted from the total gross square footage available for the library (not counting any leased space), the non-assignable square footage is 60,481 which is approximately 21% of gross. There are 241,450 net-assignable square feet of library space shown on the plan, and a total gross figure of 287,471 sq. ft.. When the calculations are performed, the 45,504 square feet of non-assignable space on the plan comes out to approximately 16% non-assignable space which is extremely good for a multi-story building. While not all spatial relationships could be verified because not all of the individual spaces were shown on the plan (Information Desks, Reference Collections, Homework Center, Magazine Call Desk etc.), the most all of the critical spatial relationships for the larger groupings of space were met by the conceptual plans with the following exception: the Reading Room is on the 8th floor, and the Special Events area is on the 9th floor, not on the ground floor as called for in the building program so that it could be used while the library is closed and not compromise library security. One separate comment that should be noted: the number of units in each restroom on each floor seems to be rather limited for a building of this size.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

San Diego Main Library 2057

R2:

Needs Assessment:

They used an excellent variety and depth of methods, with specific attempts to involve all segments of the community. The community analysis was an outstanding example of a large community with many agencies, schools, and organizations being thoroughly investigated and documented by the library, with significant contacts made and excellent documentation of implications for the new library project. In the analysis of service needs they made very good connections to the Needs Assessment results and the demographics; if anything there was a bit of over analysis here. A 50-year-old building has got to be totally inadequate, particularly as a main library for a huge urban population. The description points this out. The only issue in the space needs assessment is that there was no mention of any specific efforts regarding Spanish language materials, when Hispanics make up 25% of the population now and 1/3 by 2020. The Executive Summary was excellent except for a lack of description of the K-12 population and needs.

Plan of Service:

The plan included very clear documentation of how the project addresses both the specific needs identified by Main's immediate clientele and its broader backup role for all of San Diego. They provided clear, well-formed goals which are user-centered, with reasonable objectives and service indicators to further define these. All services are clearly and meticulously documented. If anything, the presentation is overly in-depth. Nevertheless, this has the real possibility of being a true working plan for staff and community. They provided an excellent discussion of the main library's roles in the jurisdiction-wide services and included how this project supports that.

Joint Use Agreement:

The only problem with this, which shows up throughout these ratings, relates to the staffing. The plan of service indicates the library will provide 11.00 staff for the joint venture and the district 2.75 (page 24); the agreement lists 30.25 from the library and 11.25 from the district (page 8-9), a real discrepancy. In addition, the agreement includes a huge "hedge" regarding the teachers that are to support this effort (2.0 in the plan and 6.0 in the agreement). The agreement (page 8) says the effort "...will be staffed by volunteers, ... and, upon availability, teachers..." That is really very little commitment at all.

Building Program:

Exceptionally well done general requirements section in the building program. Spatial relationships are exceptionally well detailed. The bubble diagram is highly effective in communicating to the architect the spatial relationships and adjacencies. The description of the individual spaces is moderately well done. The furniture and equipment needs of the spaces are discussed, however, so much of what makes the design of a space is missing. The fenestration, finishes, acoustics, HVAC requirements, accessibility are all needed by the architect to understand what the design of the individual spaces needs to respond to. Otherwise, the architect has to make assumptions or ask a lot of questions about the specifics for these areas.

Conceptual Plan:

The net square footage is well done. They are very good in matching the Building Program within reason. The reviewer is unable to verify the non-assignable square footage because space summary of the Building Program does not provide a concise and specific non-assignable total. There is non-assignable spaces mixed in with assignable spaces to get sub-totals for each floor. The walls, elevators, stairs do not appear to be specified in the listing of square footage. The amount of non-assignable square footage on the plan is quite low (16%) this means that it is a highly efficient building for a multi-floor building. The spatial relationships are well done in matching the Building Program requirements for the larger division areas. However, the larger areas are not divided into their respective smaller divisions which makes it difficult to verify their adjacencies. There are several places where there are discrepancies between the Building Program and what's on the plan.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

San Diego Main Library 2057

R3:

Needs Assessment:

The applicant has done an excellent job at utilizing a multi-faceted approach to gather input from the community. Focus groups, interviews with key informants, surveys, phone surveys as well as input from students and educators. They have included an excellent cross section of community groups and ethnicities in their data gathering. Have provided an extensive listing of community groups and their library service needs along with an analysis of needs.

Plan of Service:

Have done an excellent job at developing services that are responsive to identified needs. Goals, objectives, and service indicators are clearly stated and the service plan is something that is usable. An excellent job at identifying jurisdiction services that are included in this plan.

Joint Use Agreement:

This agreement (actually 5 agreements) outlines an effective approach at a partnering effort. The district has made a financial commitment (\$150,000) for leasing costs and resources. Some clarification and commitment from the district on staffing would strengthen the partnering effort.

Building program:

[Page references are to the building program document]

A table of contents listing the tables and illustrations, as well as the topics would facilitate use of the document by the planning team. Also, much material is repeated (e.g., shelving requirements, pp. 56-5 also pp. 30-31).

General requirements: excellent presentation.

Spatial relationships: Very thorough and thoughtful discussion. Inclusion of rationales behind decisions very helpful. Bubble diagrams fairly clear, and in a few instances get into nice detail of relationships (e.g., pp. 49-50).

Room sheets: Much important information on specific requirements for individual spaces is in Appendix A, but not in Room sheets.

General comments: Modular approach to info desks, copy centers, mobile compact shelving an excellent aid to design and procurement. Overall quite good set of instructions.

Conceptual plans:

Assignable square footage: Information on drawings often difficult to compare to the building program.

(1) In many spaces drawing states the program requirement Assignable square footage at some variance from what Program actually requires. E.g., First floor: Building Manager: Drawing says program wants 150 sq. ft., but Program p. 60 says 80 sf; Second floor: Compact shelving: Drawing says program wants 4,000 sf, but Program p. 75 says 504 sf; similar on other floors.

(2) Often the Drawing provides very large areas, not broken out by individual spaces per Program. E.g., 2nd floor puts many of the spaces on p. 75 into one large area, described on the drawing as having a 20,686 Program requirement. This reviewer tried several combinations of the spaces on p. 75 to arrive at 20,686, and was not able to determine exactly what went into that number.

Building Program p. 59 shows Program and Actual assignable square footage totals for each floor. Overall, the total building actual asf is 7.5% more than program. Overall, it appears that the asf for individual spaces generally is close to Program requirements, but there are many exceptions. Failure of the plans to tabulate Program and Actual in all cases makes it difficult to be certain.

The Program does not specify a gross sq. ft. target for the building. Adding the actual Gross square footage totals for each Library floor, The non-assignable sq. footage (not incl. Floors 6 and 7) is 287,471sq. ft. The non-assignable sq. footage, derived from the drawings is 241,450. That is 19% efficiency, very good.

Spatial relationships:

The drawings combine several Program spaces into one large area; as a result, this reviewer often cannot tell how well the layout responds to program requirements. Where detail is drawn, there are a few anomalies, such as 4th floor Computer Training not directly accessible from Public Access, contra Bubble diagram in the building program.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

San Diego Main Library 2057

Integration of Electronic Technologies

Regulatory Basis: p.68, 20440, Appendix 4

RATING

4

Integration of Electronic Technologies

1. Appropriateness of electronic technologies in Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment
2. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in Plan of Service
3. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

Planning documents demonstrate a very thorough understanding of the importance of technology in providing library services and a firm commitment to including it in library service responses. The new facility will provide for current and future technology needs.

R2:

The plan is comprehensive and clear. It does an excellent job of building in flexibility for future technological enhancements.

R3:

The applicant has presented an excellent plan that will be usable. Applicant has used a survey to assess issues related to the digital divide and has made recommendations to address the disparities with the proposed services.

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

San Diego Main Library 2057

Site

RATING

4

Regulatory Basis: p.39, 20440, Appendix 1

Appropriateness of Site

1. Equal access for all residents in service area.
2. Accessibility via public transit.
3. Accessibility via pedestrian and bicycle.
4. Accessibility via automobile.
5. Adequacy of automobile parking.
6. Adequacy of bicycle parking.
7. Overall parking rationale.
8. Shared parking agreement (if applicable).
9. Visibility of site & proposed library building in service area
10. How well site fits community context & planning
11. Site selection process and summary.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
N/A		
3	3	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

Site Description

12. Adequacy of size of site.
13. Appropriateness of site configuration
14. Appropriateness of site/surrounding area.
15. Appropriateness of site based on placement of building, parking, access roads, pathways, expansion and parking.

R1	R2	R3
2	3	3
3	4	4
3	4	4
3	4	4

Rating Panel Comments

Drainage issues: The project will comply with the City's best management practices to control and treat runoff with the use of filters in the drainage system etc.

Geotechnical issues: The site is located in Seismic Zone 4 and is within the mapped area of the active Rose Canyon fault zone. It is also located within the City's "Downtown Special Fault Zone," however no active faults or landslides are reported underlying, or immediately adjacent to the site. There is the potential for strong ground motion. A portion of the site's soil is contaminated and will be removed. These findings have been considered and incorporated into the design and cost estimate.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

San Diego Main Library 2057

R1:

The site is located in the southern part of the service area which is an oddly shaped area running primarily north and south. It is located in the southeastern quadrant of the downtown core of San Diego (about 6 blocks south and east of the main retail areas of the city). While I-5 and numerous other interstates bisect the service area, they will actually help provide access by residents of the City to the downtown library site due to multiple interchanges and over/under passes as opposed to creating a barrier. Along with the bay, there are a substantive number of rail lines to the south of the site, but this is off set by several trolley stations that will help provide public transit access to the site.

The library is located directly on J St. (759 vehicles per day), an east/west thoroughfare and is one block from 12th Ave (1,400 vehicles per day) and two blocks from 11th Ave (3,190 vehicles per day), both of which are north/south thoroughfares. The proposed site is located 6 blocks south of Broadway which is a major east/west thoroughfare lined with retail outlets. Horton Plaza another major retail outlet is about 12 blocks northwest of the site and Seaport Village, another retail center, is approximately 18 blocks west of the site.

The library site is within walking distance of the major retail districts of the downtown area of the City. The library will border on a \$130 million "park-to-Bay" development that is improving pedestrian walkways and a bicycle route. The site will have 207 bicycle parking spaces, 182 of which will be sheltered in the underground parking garage and 25 of which will be sheltered under a covered porch and directly visible from a security guard station near the front entrance to the library.

There are 18 public transit stops within 1/4 mile of the site. There are 12 bus lines including two express lines for commuters from the eastern part of the service area. Two new bus stops will be added directly across from the library site. There are two trolley stops 2 blocks north and south of the site. As stop for the "Coaster" a regional commuter train is within 1/2 mile of the site and the Amtrak train station is less than a mile away.

There will be 250 free on-site parking spaces in a parking garage under the library. With access to another 250 free parking spaces in either a developer built P-1 parking structure or the Tailgate Park, there will be 500 free parking spaces which it is estimated will exceed the parking demand for the next 20 years. There are 186 on-street parking spaces within 500' of the front door of the library and an unprecedented 2,386 parking spaces available to library patrons off-street and off-site, but within 500" of the front door!

The new library with its lattice covered dome will be visible from all of the highways and streets that skirt the city. The proximity of the library site to the baseball park will further enhance its visibility to the residents of the service area.

The library, along with other projects such as the ballpark, will provide a must needed stimulus for the redevelopment of the surrounding area. There will be a new Children's Museum, an expansion of the Museum of Contemporary Art, retail and commercial developments as well as more than 9,000 new homes, including 1,800 low and moderate income housing units.

There have been 45 independent studies done over a 35 year period on possible sites for a new main library for San Diego! There has been a wide range of community input through public hearings and workshops. The current site is considered the best possible location and was approved by the Mayor and City Council unanimously. The site selection criteria used are spelled out in the application.

Neither the conceptual plans nor application indicate a plan for the future expansion of the building or parking. In all likelihood, future expansion to the San Diego Public Library will be in the form of branch libraries as well as internally with the use of the additional floors that are being built at this time.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

San Diego Main Library 2057

R2:

The site has a great location. Although at the moment it is at the edge of the downtown area and destination shopping, the area around it will continue to develop. It is in the heart of the PetCo Park - Convention Center area, on the Balboa Park to Bay bicycle, pedestrian and vehicle way being developed. It is close to freeways, light rail, etc., and is served by many local and express bus routes. Even Amtrak and the Coaster commuter train are not far away.

Free parking for 500 cars, including 250 in a garage below the building, is an astounding accomplishment. 207 bike space. The 250' high glow-in-the-dark lattice dome will be visible all around. But as above, it is on a not-yet-beaten path. The site is a major contributor to the City's vision of its future. Although not quite the anchor of the area, it is a momentous enhancement. It is the culmination of a decades-long series of almost two score studies, and involved a multitude of focus groups, interviews, surveys, etc. All involved should be congratulated in keeping their eye on the prize.

The site size barely can accommodate the footprint, incl. the underground garage. But big city downtown Main Library sites typically are not parks, much as San Diego would like to emulate The NYPL 42d St. Library and Bryant Park. The site works okay.

Given the limited and somewhat teardrop-shaped site, the configuration does a good job of exploiting the hinge on 12th/Park. The Park-to-Bay path will be heavily used before long, and more than compensate for not being next door to Horton Plaza. Access and parking are well done for pedestrians, cars and bicycles. A particularly nice touch is providing a separate entrance to the Children's Library.

R3:

This is an outstanding location for a new main library in a major city. There are 18 bus stops within 1/4 mile of the site, with an additional two to be added just across the street when the library opens. Two trolley stations are two blocks away to the north and south. Pedestrian and bicycle access is exceptional with existing improved corridors from the new library site through the new ballpark region to the Gaslamp Quarter and the planned Park-to-Bay Promenade along 12th Avenue. While rush hour in this major urban area will slow traffic, accessibility by car is still exceptionally good -- access to 3 major freeways within six blocks of the site. Parking is likewise unusually good for a major urban downtown: there will be 250 free on-site/off street spaces in an underground structure and an additional 250 free spaces off site in a structure/lot just across the street. There is also plentiful paid parking in the immediate area (over 2,500 spaces within 500 feet). 207 bicycle spaces are provided, 182 of which will be sheltered in the underground structure. The domed multi-story structure will be prominently visible on this site, midway between the Balboa Park and the convention center and bay. The proposed new library is part of a massive urban development effort to transform San Diego into a world class urban center. Selection of the site was the result of extensive planning and community input over a 35 year time span. The site will accommodate the proposed project well, but will not permit easy expansion in the future.

EVALUATION FORM
San Diego Main Library 2057

Financial Capacity

Regulatory Basis: Bond Act p. 5, Section 19998 (a) (7)

Rating Panel Comments:

Applicant has committed to the on-going operation of the completed library.